

# Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT ALL THE LAND, UNTO ALL THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOL. IV.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER, 1858.

No. 4.

The Radical Abolitionist,

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

## TERMS

Per Annum, or for Twelve Numbers.

SINGLE COPIES,.....	\$0.50
FIVE COPIES, directed to one person,.....	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do. ....	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do. ....	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do. ....	10.00

Payments in Advance.

Tobitt's Combination-Type, 181 William-Street.

## "INDEPENDENCE OF THE JUDICIARY."

The Tribune objects against Gerrit Smith's proposal to remove the Judges who should decide a prohibitory law to be unconstitutional, and inquires—

"Does it evince due regard for the independence of the Judiciary? That a Judge may be removed for malfeasance, crime, gross debauchery or idiocy, we concede; but how would it answer to expel Judges from office because their decisions on a grave and difficult question did not accord with the views of the Governor and Legislature? What security for life, liberty and property, would such a system and practice afford?"

We do not understand the Tribune to deny that the Constitution of this State does confer upon the Governor and Legislature the powers claimed for them by Gerrit Smith. The Tribune, we think, will not controvert that fact. Then, the only question must be in respect to the fitness and propriety of exercising the power, in such a case. Let us look at it. The power must have been conferred to promote the public good, and to be exercised when and where and upon whom, the public good requires it. A power never to be exercised would be nugatory. The possession of power involves responsibility. If the people had thought such power in the hands of the Governor and Legislature, dangerous, or improper to be exercised for the public good, they would not have conferred it. Having been conferred and accepted, it is to be exercised, on proper occasions, until it is withdrawn. Those who think the power ought not to have been conferred, nor to be exercised, ought not to accept the responsibilities of the office. E. D. Morgan, the Tribune's candidate, is perfectly at liberty to decline the responsibility if he chooses. But that is no rule for Gerrit Smith.

Let us next inquire into the significance and extent of the Tribune's concessions. "A Judge may be removed for malfeasance, crime, gross debauchery, or idiocy." What is the import of those terms? We will inquire of Noah Webster.

"Malfeasance" is "evil doing, wrong, illegal deed. In law, the performance of some injurious act which the party had contracted not to do, or had no right to do." "Crime—in a common or restricted sense denotes—"a public wrong"—"offences against laws made to preserve public rights," &c. "Debauchery"

includes—"Corruption from fidelity—seduction from duty or allegiance."

Now what does the Tribune think of the conduct of the Judges who set aside the Prohibitory law as unconstitutional? What has the Tribune said of them, in times past? What has its readers been led to think of them? Have they understood from the Tribune that they were not guilty of "evil doing"—"wrong"—"a public wrong—against laws to preserve public rights? That they have manifested no "corruption from fidelity" or "seduction from duty?" Is the Tribune prepared to say this? Is it ready to exonerate them from imputations like these? If so, the Tribune has changed its tone, or its readers have failed to comprehend its teachings.

We hope to evince no want of due regard for the "independence of the Judiciary" but by this we do not mean their independence of the people—their independence of moral principle—the independence that consists in servility to the rum-power and the caucus-power that nominates them—an independence that prompts them to thwart the known will of the people, who were intent on protecting themselves by salutary laws from the ravages of destroyers more ruthless than savages, more mercenary than demons. Ought not such Judges to be removed? We carry that question to the ballot box.

We appeal to the people. We ask them "what security for life, liberty, or property" would the retaining of such Judges "afford?" We ask them, whether they will withhold their votes from Gerrit Smith, for fear that, in the exercise of his unquestioned Constitutional powers, he would help to rid the bench of such Judges, and thus protect from rum-made maniacs, the lives of innocent men, women and children? We ask them, finally, what they think of the political leadership of a Journal that, on such grounds, deems Gerrit Smith "an unwise and unsound statesman, and deprecates his election as Governor"—preferring the non-prohibitionist, E. D. Morgan? Is this what we have been accustomed to expect from the N. Y. Tribune?

## GERRIT SMITH ON POLYGAMY.

The N. Y. Tribune quotes Gerrit Smith as follows.

"Mr. Smith was here asked his opinion on the subject of Polygamy, and in reply said, that the Civil Government could interfere with any religious faith which infringed upon common rights. The census tables show that there was but one man to each woman, and one woman for each man. It followed that when one man got ten women he robbed nine men, and when one woman should have ten husbands she would rob nine women of their rights. [Laughter.] Government should interpose."

Mr. Smith, as the Tribune states, said in reply to an interrogator who had inquired whether he could prohibit polygamy, consistently with his doctrine that "Government has no rightful power to do more than protect persons and property." The Tribune calls the answer "transparent sophistry" and tries to show that "Mr. Smith seeks to elude the legitimate consequences of his own doctrines."

In attempting to do this, the Tribune (by mistake doubtless) repeats Mr. Smith's doctrine with an impor-

tant variation. "Government has no other duties than those involved in the protection of life and property"—instead of "persons and property." Personal protection includes more than mere protection of "life." It includes marital rights, and the rights of society, for Society is composed of persons.

So the Tribune discovers exceptions, in the Census tables, to the general law of equal number of sexes, and thence concludes that Mr. Smith's argument would fail in New York City, where there are more females than males, and in California where there are more males than females. Just as though general laws are repealed or made void by exceptions. And then, again because some men do not choose to marry, and it might be thence pleaded that there is a surplus of females so that it would be no robbery for some men to have two wives (forgetting that some women, also, do not choose to marry, thus equalizing the excess) the Tribune proceeds to infer the fallacy of Mr. Smith's answer, and exclaims, triumphantly—

"Who does not see that the punishment of adultery is at war with Mr. Smith's fundamental assumption—that his sphere of Government is too narrow—that he is compelled to evade or subvert his own principle whenever it is confronted with inevitable facts?"

Now it strikes us that this is a pitiful business, for the Tribune. Who does not know that the argument quoted as from Mr. Smith is common with ethical writers on that subject? Who, before, ever knew it objected against? Or inferred from it that those who used it could have no grounds for the punishment of adultery, as an invasion of marital rights, and a crime against society, which is a crime against persons?

If the Tribune does not regard crimes against society as violations of personal rights, it ought to conceive it possible for others to do so.—And it has no right to assume that, because, in the haste of a brief reply to a question, Mr. Smith adduced only one evidence that the punishment of polygamy was consistent with his theory, that therefore no other evidence or illustration could have been adduced by him.

Yet, on this bald assumption, and for a mere reason that Mr. Smith's theoretical ground for punishing polygamy, does not suffice to satisfy the Tribune, it sets down Mr. Smith "as an unwise and unsound Statesman, and deprecates his election as Governor," though he is as much in favor of punishing polygamy as the Tribune itself!

If the Tribune would advertise the public how difficult it finds the task of trumping up objections against GERRIT SMITH, it is in a fair way of making itself understood.

MOVEMENT IN OHIO.—The Abolitionists of the 5th Congressional district of Ohio have started an independent Ticket, with the name of WM. A. HUNTER, Esq. for Congress. He is a strong man. The address to the voters, from his pen, is high toned, abounding with facts and arguments that must cut a wide path before him. We notice that the Resolutions of the Convention that nominated him, take strong ground against the Rum traffic, and offensive War, as well as against Slavery, and the rendition of fugitives.

Copy to W. A. Hunter



**DE BOW'S REVIEW ON SLAVERY.**—A correspondent brings to our notice an article in *De Bow's Review* for the current month, entitled "African Slavery, adapted to the North and Northwest," containing a passage upon which he solicits our comments. The passage is as follows:

"If the Union be desirable, [and with a rigid regard of mutual rights by the North and South, no one will deny its inestimable value.] it is earnestly considered that the most effectual means of giving it perpetuity will be realized in the opening of the Slave-trade, and the introduction of our peculiar institution into the western States and Territories. By this we will construct a homogeneous system of labor, and through this bond of sympathy will be re-established that community of sentiment, and the old *entente cordiale*, without which the Constitution is a rope of sand, and the Union a shallow mockery."

A proposition to re-open the Slave-trade and to introduce Slavery into the North, scarcely deserves comment. Its appearance in *De Bow's Review* merely shows, what was no secret before, that some Southern extremists look upon the renewal of the Slave-trade as practicable. Even at the South this idea is regarded by an immense majority as not only chimerical but injurious to Southern interests. Indeed, the project is utterly out of the question. The Northern preponderance in Congress is already too decided to permit anything of the kind, and every year adds to that preponderance. Proposals like that to which our correspondent refers may continue to be put forth in some hot-headed quarters, but can hardly be entitled to serious notice. *De Bow's Review* is the favorite periodical of the fire-eaters, and is prepared with reference to their partialities exclusively.

[N. Y. Times, Oct. 12.]

"*Scarcely deserves comment.*"—So said the Free Soil papers when it was first proposed to repeal the Missouri Compromise. Some "Southern extremists" said they "regarded it as practicable. Even at the South this idea is regarded by the immense majority not only as chimerical but injurious to Southern interests." And "Northern preponderance in Congress is already too decided to permit any thing of the kind, and every year adds to its preponderance."—So they cried Peace! Peace!

The "Southern extremists," however, prevailed, and they are quite as likely to prevail again, unless a type of sterner opposition is inaugurated. No amount of "Northern preponderance in Congress" will avail any thing, while it is controlled by the now prevalent maxims of concession and tactics of compromise.

If slavery be permitted to exist, the slave-trade must, as a matter, of course, be authorized by the Federal Government and protected in all the States and Territories. There is no help for that. A "homogeneous system of labor" will have to be exhibited, if the Union is to be continued. Thus far, Mr. De Bow is more philosophical than the Times—more far seeing than Free Soilers and Republican. Free labor and slave labor, free institutions and slave institutions cannot live peacefully together in the same nation, especially after the struggle between them has commenced, and gone into national politics, as in this country.

#### BRING OUT YOUR CANDIDATE.

Bring out your candidate, if you are not ashamed of him! Let the people know what he intends to do, as Governor. A stuffed ourang-outang skin seated in the Gubernatorial Chair, would answer the purpose just as well, if the only object is to fill the vacancy! What does your candidate propose to do? Shut up the dramshops—those manufactories of murderers?—enact a Personal Liberty Law to protect human beings from the hands of the kidnapper?—carry out the primary object of Civil Government? Or simply mount himself upon the high stool, just because it is the fashion to have somebody sit there? What has he done—what is he doing—what will he do, for Temperance—for Freedom? Let us know all about him! The People are heartily tired of these dumb dogs, and won't be cheated with them much longer! They must know the principles of those for whom they are asked to vote. The mere fact that the candidate is of such or such a Political Party is very indefinite, just at present. Those who follow Parties now-a-days find themselves progressing in a similar manner to

the poor helmsman who was trying to steer by a flock of sheep! Let us know what your Candidate proposes to do? What are his views of the province of Civil Government. Bring him out! Let him speak for himself!

#### GERRIT SMITH ON A REGISTRY LAW.

The N. Y. Tribune quotes Mr. Smith as saying:

"On this point he was with the American party. He sympathized with it in its attempt to secure the purity of the ballot-box. If a Registry Law failed, he would have something better, but he would confine it to the large towns and cities; there it was necessary to save the vote of an honest man from being counteracted by the vote of a scoundrel."

The fair construction of this is, that Mr. Smith is in favor of a Registry Law, wherever a Registry Law is needed, to protect the right of suffrage. In the region of country where he lived, and in the greater part of the State, he supposed it was not needed. Here is only a question of fact, and of detail—not of principle.

But the Tribune, intent on carping at Gerrit Smith, alleges that there has been illegal voting in the "State of Louisiana" by which votes were "stolen from Henry Clay and given to Mr. Polk"—that "this was in a rural district where there are scarcely twenty houses in sight, at any one point." "In the State of Minnesota" too, frauds were committed in the wildest woods"—also "in the wilds of Aroostic, in Maine."

Very well. Let the Tribune make it apparent that there are "wild districts" in New York, like those of Louisiana, Wisconsin, and Maine, where a Registry law is needed, and no doubt he will find Gerrit Smith in favor of a Registry law for them also. And if the Legislature should think it best to make such a law for the whole state, nobody supposes that Gerrit Smith, if Governor, would interpose his veto—as the principle has his hearty approval.

And yet the Tribune gravely brings forth and parades Mr. Smith's views of the Registry law, as one of the six weighty reasons why "thousands who love Gerrit Smith for his philanthropy and goodness of heart, deem him an unwise and unsound statesman and therefore, deprecate his election as Governor."

This would be quite amusing—were it not pitiful to see the depths to which "wise and sound Statesmen" can descend.

Objections against Gerrit Smith must be in great demand, which such an one as this stands as Number II. among VI.

#### OUR CANDIDATES.

The Candidates we present to the public attention are known to be earnest advocates of Temperance and Freedom, in favor of thorough uncompromising measures for their promotion, and are, every way, suitable for the stations which we propose that they should occupy.

**GERRIT SMITH**, of Madison County, our Candidate for Governor has been so long known, not only throughout this State, but the nation, and in other countries, that we deem it superfluous, in this place, to enlarge on his qualifications and his claims to our enthusiastic support.

**SIDNEY A. BEERS**, of Kings County, our Candidate for Lieut.-Governor, is also well known as an efficient laborer in the cause for which he is nominated—a man of energy, with an untarnished reputation in all the relations of life—one who is ready to aid or defend the innocent against oppression or outrage, and who has, with the voice and pen, contributed to promulge the principles and defend the measures of reform—a man who will never be flattered or drawn into compromises with the enemy we wage war against.

**SILAS T. FYLER**, of Madison County, our Candidate for State Prison Inspector, is well known to the friends of Temperance and Freedom, in that part of the State. It is sufficient to say of him that his nomination has the cordial approbation of Gerrit Smith.

**JOHN C. HARRINGTON**, of Oswego County, our Candidate for Canal Commissioner, has been well known to us, and to the friends of the objects we advocate, for many years, and this is not the first time that his name has been before the people of this State for their suffrages. The cause of freedom, and the cause of temperance has no more steady, persevering, consistent, and faithful supporter than John C. Harrington.

We do not bring forward candidates who need to be questioned on the vital points of our enterprise—nor candidates whose responses to questions in respect to them are ambiguous or Janus-faced. Their "yea is yea, and their nay, nay."—What they say, they mean, and what they mean, they are heartily at work to accomplish.

#### N. Y. TRIBUNE vs. GERRIT SMITH.

After about a week's deliberation and preparation, the Tribune has loaded and ventured to discharge a broadside of two long columns at the answers of Gerrit Smith to his interrogators in Cooper Institute.

The first noticeable circumstance is, the carefulness of the sportsman to avoid hitting his mark. Every body knows that Gerrit Smith was nominated, and is in the field, primarily for two great objects—namely, the protection of the good people of this State from rum poisoners and from kidnappers. The Tribune's shot barely grazes the first, and gives a wide berth to the second. The Tribune had advertised the people that these two little objects did not come within the magnificent designs and plans of the Republican party. It ignored them. So the people who nominated Mr. Smith, ignored the Republican party.

And what says the Tribune? Why this. The Tribune does not like Mr. Smith's views [1] "with regard to the relative powers of the Executive and Judiciary"; [2] on the subject of the Registry Law; [3] on the subject of Common Schools; [4] on the question whether Kansas was saved by Crittenden-Lecompton votes and Senator Douglass, or by Sharp's Rifles and John Brown of Osawatamie; [5] on "Mr. Smith's doctrine" (the doctrine of Jefferson and some other respectable writers,) "that Government has no rightful power to do any more than protect persons and property"; [6] On the question whether "the running of Gerrit Smith will conduce to the election of Amasa J. Parker"!

On all these topics, upon which Mr. Smith submitted to be publicly interrogated, the Tribune does not like his replies, and thinks that a man holding such views ought not to be elected Governor—not even for the sake of protecting the people from poisoners and from kidnappers; which the other three nominating Conventions had declined doing, or even trying to do.

Does the Tribune suppose that the friends of Liquor Prohibition and Personal Protection will decline voting for them in voting for Gerrit Smith, and turn round, and virtually vote for continued liquor licenses and the toleration of kidnapping, by voting for E. D. Morgan, because they may perhaps differ from Mr. Smith, in some of the answers given by him to all sorts of questions on all other topics? Would that be acting like "practical business men"? Would the Tribune require or desire a Republican voter to erase from his ticket the name of any Republican candidate who, on any of these topics, or on all of them, should happen to believe with Gerrit Smith?

We all know that it would not wish a Republican voter to erase the name of a Republican Candidate, merely because he happened to differ with him on so trifling a matter as the duty of shutting up the poison and insanity and murder shops, against the tolerance of which the Tribune itself has, in former times so vehemently, and so eloquently declaimed, and there by built up the Republican party, swelling its numbers and its influence by the accession of scores of thousands of prohibitionists, who believed that the Republican party would put down the nuisance.

And we all know that the Tribune would not have a Republican erase the name of his regularly nominated Republican Candidate, merely because he



held "the province of the State Government to be so very narrow" that it could neither put down the murder manufactories nor protect a single baby, white or colored (for the Fugitive bill makes no difference) from the fangs of the kidnapper.

Tastes differ. And so do estimates of the comparative importance of political questions and measures.—The Tribune may think it more important that a candidate should conform to the generally received opinions or to its own opinion concerning Executive and Judicial powers, the Registry of votes, Common schools, the instruments of saving Kansas, the extent of the powers of Government beyond bare protection, and the prospects of electing one Rum and Slavery candidate instead of another—than that he should be a tower of strength against murder shops and kidnapping. But many voters of the Empire State will persist in holding a very different opinion.

If Gerrit Smith had but been known as an out-and-out member of the Republican party, voting, uniformly, a whole ticket, whether pro-rum or anti-rum, pro-slavery or anti-slavery, who doubts that he would have been a most desirable gubernatorial Candidate for the Republican party? And, if duly nominated by that party, who believes that even the scrupulously careful New York Tribune would have advised Republican voters to erase his name from the ticket on account of any or all the supposed political heresies now charged upon him by that Journal? At another time we may look at some of these supposed political heresies of Gerrit Smith, taking care not to be diverted from keeping before the people the MAIN ISSUES upon which the PEOPLE'S STATE TICKET has been nominated.

In the mean time we challenge the Tribune to persuade its candidate, E. D. MORGAN, to come before the people and answer interrogatories, as GERRIT SMITH does, that the people may judge for themselves, which is the greater heretic of the two.

#### "ERA OF GOOD FEELING."

It is amusing to look over the files of Democratic and Republican papers, about these days. The Democratic Editors are boasting that the Republicans have come on to their ground, and they cite the Republican vote on the Crittenden-Leecompton bill, the Worcester speech of Eli Thayer, &c. in proof of the statement. On the other hand, the Republican editors are complaining that the Democratic nominees, in Maine and elsewhere, have been making capital and gaining votes by professing to be, substantially, with the Republicans, being opposed to forcing slavery upon Kansas, and ready to receive her as a free state.

If their joint testimony is to be received, the two parties are approaching an "era of good feeling" like that witnessed under the Administration of Monroe, after the Old Federal party found itself used up, and obsolete. Could they only "compromise" and divide between them the offices and the spoils, as readily as they do their professed principles, and the interests of freedom and temperance, we should have peaceable times. As it is, the *ins* and the *outs* must needs mystify, and wrangle, and recriminate. The prizes are worth fighting for.

#### Do we need a Governor in favor of Prohibition?

When the New York Tribune was earnestly advocating the election of Myron H. Clark to the office of Governor, and soliciting votes for him on the ground of his prohibition principles, did it doubt that the official power and influence of the Governor was of great importance toward securing the adoption of that measure? What would it have said of any one who should have represented that, since the Governor was neither the Legislature nor the Judiciary, it was not worth while to insist on having a prohibitionist for Governor? With what epithets would it have characterized a person who should have thus argued? Why then should the Tribune advance such an argument against the nomination and support of Gerrit Smith?

But the Judges—or some of them—we are told, have decided against the Constitutionality of the prohibitory act. Is that a good reason for not trying to elect Judges in favor of prohibition? And, in the interim, can we do a better thing than to elect a Governor in favor of prohibition, and by so doing, create and manifest a public sentiment in favor of the measure?

Besides, the Judges have not decided against the principle of prohibition, but only against certain features of the Act. Who knows but that the skill and influence of a Governor like Gerrit Smith, might devise and secure the passage of an Act that even the present Judges would not presume to set aside?

#### Gen. Harrison—Correction Corrected.

A correspondent of the New York Tribune, of October 15, undertakes to correct Gerrit Smith's statement, in Montague Hall, Brooklyn, that Gen. Harrison, when a candidate for the Presidency, "was in charge of a Committee" who answered questions for him. The writer says that "Gen. Harrison went before the people, he was not afraid of interrogations, as he was an honest, open hearted and patriotic man, and had no concealments." "He took the stump—was at Tippecanoe, (Ind.) Fort Meigs, Cleveland, Dayton, and other places, and addressed large gatherings of the people," &c., &c.

True. But this is only a part of the story. It was his "honest, open hearted" utterances that disturbed his political friends, and induced them to put him in charge of a Committee. The fact is undeniable. It was publicly announced, and the Old General publicly excused himself from answering any more questions, referring inquirers to the Committee. We remember that fact as well as we do the meeting at Montague Hall. Mr. Smith did no "injustice to the memory of Gen. Harrison." He only censured the partizan usages by which an "honest, open hearted man" was gagged and belittled, as he ought not to have been.

THE WANT OF A NATIONAL ISSUE BEFORE THE PEOPLE—HOW TO WIN IN 1860.—The condition of political parties throughout the country exhibits a disintegration everywhere that puzzles the politicians and nonplusses the partisan leaders of every stripe. All the old issues that have served as party slogans to rally hosts of voters, now fall upon the public ear. The currents of popular opinion are at slackwater point, and everybody is watching to see in which direction the tide will set for the flood of 1860.—*N. Y. Herald.*

The *Herald's* remedy for this is a rally for General Scott, who is now the *Herald's* favorite, as Fremont was in 1856. We shall see whether the *Herald* will control the Republican Nomination, a second time. In all this, the *Herald* progresses not a single inch towards suggesting "an issue" upon which Gen. Scott is to receive votes.

No national issue! And so the *Herald* supposes that the attempted extension of slavery in all the States and Territories "under the Constitution of the United States" and on claim of a right "before and higher than any constitutional sanction"—the threat to open again the African Slave trade—to enact a Slave Code for the Territories—to make New York a Slave State by reversing the decision of Judge Paine—that all this, furnishes no basis for a National issue in 1860. We do not much wonder that the supineness and timidity of the Republican leaders makes the *Herald* think so. The people are preparing to meet the issue in a style that will yet astonish both the *Herald* and the Republican leaders.

The issue is—"Slavery in all of the States, or in none of them."

Will such an issue "fall upon the public ear?" Reader! What say you?

VASTLY FUNNY.—The vehemence with which the Republicans berate Abolitionists and Prohibitionists for not swallowing their Party Ticket—at the same time earnestly assuring them that they go for neither Abolition nor Prohibition!

ADMINISTRATION AND OPPOSITION PARTIES.—We are experiencing, in a large measure, the disadvantages of having too many political parties. There should be but two. In the nature of the case there is rational ground for no more. Those two should comprise the supporters of the National Administration on the one hand, and its opponents on the other. This is the natural and common-sense division; all other lines of separation are factitious and arbitrary.—*New York Times.*

The *Times* is right. There should be but two parties. In effect there can be but two—there are but two. The one is the pro-slavery, pro-rum party. The other is the abolition and prohibition party. All other attempted parties are mere shams, the ephemeral existence of which only tends to perpetuate "the National Administration party." There is no way to put down that party but to pull down the props it rests upon, to remove the hateful nuisances it fattens upon—*Still-slops and slavery.*

Without these, what would become of the Administration party?

With these left undisturbed, what can it not do?

(From the Gerrit Smith Banner.)

#### TO THE VOTERS OF KINGS COUNTY.

GENTLEMEN, we ask you to look at the People's State ticket in another column. Our object, in the nomination of these names, was to elect if we can men who have long been known as the able and fear, less defenders of human rights, as against the rum seller, the man stealer, and party tyranny. The fame of Gerrit Smith as a great and good man, is not confined to the United States. Our object is to redeem, by political action, as soon as possible, our favored State from the demoralizing, and disgraceful consequences of the rum traffic, the Slave hunting laws, and Political Party Servitude. We ask, or expect no support to our measures from political leaders, of any Party, but to the people, whose votes they claim. We would say, have you not been deceived long enough by that class of men; have not your own families, and the widows and orphans which the rum traffic has made among your acquaintance, stronger and more reasonable claims on you to defend them against the destroyer? Do not flatter yourselves with the belief that your own souls will escape the anguish which many parents now suffer as the legitimate effect of a similar course. When the destroyer, by stealthy steps shall invade the home sanctuary, and claim as the penalty of your crime (for crime it is) the sacrifice of a beloved son, or father, and thus desolate your heart and hearth, for the residue of the journey of life, we place the responsibility before you, disregard it if you will, yours be the guilt; You will be told by the criminal, and his equally guilty abettor and apologist that you will throw away your vote by giving it for the People's ticket; Believe and adopt such infamous advice, if you can.

To the Temperance voters of Brooklyn, we say: will you go for the only ticket which represents your principles, or for the "half loaf" party? Last year they promised you largely, but your "half loaf" turned out to be a licence law, in place of a prohibitory law then in your possession. And now, if this is the measure of their favor, when they promised you every thing, what are you to expecting next at their hands, when they promise you nothing, and give you the notice in distinct terms, through the Tribune? L.

It is said that Mr. Watkins draws immense audiences in maller towns i which he speaks. Very likely—the spectacle of a man supporting a party which sanctions the doom of his race to slavery, must be novel and appetizing, to those who are themselves growing accustomed to the rule of the South.

REPUBLICANISM IN MASSACHUSETTS.—BOSTON, Oct. 8, 1858.—In the Ninth district the Hon. Eli Trayer, Republican, has been unanimously nominated for reelection in Congress.

This is the Mr. Thayer, who, at the late State Republican Convention in Massachusetts, repudiated, entirely the old opinion that it is the right and duty of Congress to legislate for the Territories.



## PEOPLE'S TICKET.

STATE OF NEW-YORK.

FOR GOVERNOR,

GERRIT SMITH,

OF MADISON COUNTY.

FOR LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR,

SIDNEY A. BEERS,

OF KINGS COUNTY.

FOR STATE-PRISON INSPECTOR,

SILAS T. FYLER,

OF MADISON COUNTY.

FOR CANAL COMMISSIONER,

JOHN C. HARRINGTON,

OF OSWEGO COUNTY.

Our friends in every county can obtain the votes for the State ticket at \$2 per thousand, including posters. Send your orders at once to Thos. L. Carson, Syracuse, Geo. W. Clark, 22 Beaver Street, Albany, or to Wm. Goodell, 48 Beekman Street, New York.

## Radical Abolitionist.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER, 1858.

We anticipate our usual time of publishing, in order to reach our readers in the State of New York, before the November election.

Our friends in other States may be assured that we are in the midst of stirring times.

We are publishing from our office, a Daily campaign paper called "THE GERRIT SMITH BANNER," chiefly for distribution in New York City and vicinity.

From this Daily, our present Number of the Radical Abolitionist is chiefly made up; and its contents will give our readers some idea of the battle we are engaged in.

We are greatly in want of funds.

Will not our friends make an effort to supply us with the needed means of prosecuting our work with vigor.

## LETTER OF GERRIT SMITH.

TO THE FRIENDS OF TEMPERANCE AND FREEDOM IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK:

I have now visited the Northern and Southern, Eastern and Western parts of our State, and held Meetings in a majority of the Counties. Hence I am now better prepared than I was to answer certain inquiries which are frequently made of me. They are substantially answered in what follows.

My first tours into the Counties afforded me evidence, as abundant as painful, that the causes of Temperance and Freedom were little better than dead. Most of the friends of these causes had gone into the Republican Party; and had become so partyized, as to be far more concerned for their Party than for Temperance or Freedom. Of the many of them who have told me that I was ruining the Republican Party, very few seemed to have any remaining interest in either Temperance or Freedom.

But the resuscitation of these causes has begun; and I trust that ere long they will appear in fuller life and greater vigor than ever.

I wish it were in my power to report to you the probability of the success of your candidate. But it is not. Mr. Morgan will probably draw enough votes from me to defeat me. The sham candidate for Temperance and Freedom will in this wise prevent the success of the real candidate. In other words, so many votes will be thrown away upon Edwin D. Morgan, as to leave little chance for the election of

Gerrit Smith. I say *thrown away*—for surely no person who knows what is passing in our State, can believe that Mr. Morgan is to be elected, or to come any where near being elected.

In spite of the frank admission of the New York Tribune, that "Prohibition and Republicanism are totally independent of each other"; that "the Republicans never adopted any Temperance platform," but "distinctly and emphatically refused to make Liquor Prohibition a part of its platform," deceiving politicians are nevertheless able to dupe ten thousand abolitionists and prohibitionists into the belief that the Republican Party and Mr. Morgan are intent on shutting up the dramshop and abolishing slavery.

We have seen what that Party is in respect to Prohibition. Does it sustain any better relation to Abolition? It does not. Does it propose to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia? Even the Free Soil Party, with Mr. Van Buren at its head, proposed that: but the Republican Party does not. Does it propose to abolish the inter-State traffic in human flesh? More than thirty years ago Daniel Webster and other conservatives held it to be Constitutional to do that. Nevertheless the Republican party does not propose to do it. Does it propose the repeal of the infamous and infernal Fugitive Slave Act? It does not. Does it propose to enact a law promising protection to all the innocent in this State? It does not. Eighteen months ago a Republican legislature refused to enact it. It preferred to surrender to the kidnapper the prey he is in pursuit of. Well may the Tribune say also that the Republican Party "never adopted any Abolition Platform."

Now in all these particulars Mr. Morgan is manifestly in the fullest harmony with his Party. He, like it, does not propose to abolish or disturb any part of American slavery. He, like it, does not propose to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating drinks. Indeed, he was the only Senator who dodged the vote on the Prohibitory Bill—having been in his seat ten minutes before the vote, and being there again ten minutes after the vote. My authority for saying this will not be disputed.

How shameful in these circumstances are the deceptions which the Republican Party is practising! It has got into its hands the New York State Temperance Society—that poor contemptible thing which has for years been little else than a tail to the Republican kite—and the chief men in which are now busy, with their lips and presses, to persuade Temperance men that Mr. Morgan is a Temperance man and a Prohibitionist.

The Republican Party has also got hold of a few colored men, and is using them to promote Mr. Morgan's election. This is indeed the basest and cruellest of all its manoeuvres. Getting colored men to work for a Party, which refuses to say that colored men shall not be chased by the kidnapper!—which refuses to say that colored men shall not be sent from this State into the hell of slavery!—which refuses to say that colored men shall not be classed with horses and hogs! What white men would work with a party, that poured such contempt on white men? Is it not enough, that our poor colored brethren are outraged and trampled under foot by others? Must they be employed to sink themselves still lower than their enemies have sunk them? Must they be set to work to kill all their self-respect? What colored man will ever again be able to respect himself, after he shall have labored this Fall for the success of the Republican Party and Mr. Morgan? And pray what is it that inclines a small part (it happily is but a small part) to vote with the Republican Party? It is the promise that this Party will extend universal suffrage to black men. Delusive promise! The people of this State will never repent of the wrong of excluding the black man from the ballot box until they shall have first repented of the infinitely greater wrong of leaving him to be the prey of the kidnapper.

I trust that you will not interpret me as saying that the Republican Party occupies any lower ground with respect to slavery and the dramshop than the other parties do. Its ground here is in common with theirs. The Republican Party is worse than the Democratic and Native American Parties, only inasmuch as it is a stupendous hypocrite and utter humbug. Our special complaint of the Republican Party is that its demagogues are in the habit of stealing our flag, and by that means getting votes to which we alone are entitled; and which it is as unprincipled and impudent in them, as it would be in the Democratic and American Parties, to lay claim to. That there are more antislavery and temperance men in the Republican than in either of the other Parties I readily admit. But what avails all this, so long as they suffer proslavery and pro-*rum* demagogues to mould the policy and govern the action of the Party?

I trust too that you will not interpret me as saying that Mr. Morgan's position in regard to slavery and the dramshop is worse than that of Mr. Parker or Mr. Burrows. The position of all three in this regard is

essentially the same. Whilst I am happy to believe that they are all gentlemen of unblemished private life, I am sorry to be obliged to add, that they are all equally and glaringly unfaithful to the claims of Freedom and Temperance and just civil government.

I said that my election is not probable. We are not however to despair of it. We are to hope and to labor for it unceasingly. Never was I farther from despairing of it; and never was I working harder for it. It is true, that among the four candidates my vote may be the least. It will indeed be an amazing triumph of truth, if it is not. For, standing as I do outside of party, I have the whole press and machinery of party against me. But it is also true, that if Mr. Parker is not elected, I shall be. For whilst the men, who propose to vote for me, are restrained by a commanding moral principle from going over to any man, who is not for shutting up the dramshop and shutting out the kidnapper from our State, there is no moral principle to forbid the friends of Mr. Parker, or Mr. Burrows or Mr. Morgan to vote for me.

In a word, if as circumstances are—Mr. Morgan's chance of election being desperate—Mr. Parker shall be elected, it will be because the Republicans prefer his election to mine. The Republicans will go to the polls not to elect Mr. Morgan, but to choose between Amasa J. Parker and Gerrit Smith.

I said that we are not to despair. Already have tens of thousands of Republicans come out of their Party to our standard; and tens of thousands more will follow if their party leaders will only let them see the certain defeat of Mr. Morgan. Is it too much to hope for that they will get to see it? Can they credit much longer the cunning misrepresentations at this point of these deceiving leaders? Then again, are there not thousands of Native Americans who had rather our ticket would prevail than the Democratic? Let but the Republicans and Native Americans become convinced that neither Mr. Morgan nor Mr. Burrows can succeed, and the chance of my election is tenfold greater than even that of Mr. Parker.

Farewell until the Election. My work this week is in Tioga and surrounding Counties: next week in St. Lawrence, Franklin, Clinton and Essex: and the following week in Delaware and contiguous Counties. Be assured that nothing shall be lacking on my part to make the war we are waging against rum and slavery and party despotism an effective and triumphant one.

GERRIT SMITH.

Peterboro, Oct. 10, 1858.

## INFLUENCE OF GERRIT SMITH.

When Gerrit Smith was in Congress, his influence, though an opponent of the Administration, was so great with Secretary Marcy, as also with the British Minister, that he procured of them the Reciprocity Treaty, between the United States and Canada, a measure of great benefit to both the Countries, and for which they are chiefly indebted to him. The measure was emphatically his, and his known honesty sound statesmanship, and elevation above all mere partizan or even international jugglery, secured for him the respectful attention of both the distinguished officials, and ultimately, their mutual and cordial approbation of his measure. No other man, perhaps, in either nation, could have succeeded in the volunteer negotiation.

His influence also with the Legislature of this State at Albany, where he had no patronage to bestow, and no political partizans to back him, was so strong as to bring the Assembly within seven votes of passing his proposed Personal Liberty bill, which would have made New York the first and only free State in the Union.

Are the friends of Liquor Prohibition, of a Personal Liberty bill, to be told—are the constantly-exposed people of color, to be told—that it would be no manner of benefit to them, and to the interests and rights so dear to them, to have such a friend and advocate of their claims as GERRIT SMITH elected to the office of Governor of the State?

Why! If the Abolitionists, the Prohibitionists, and the victims of the kidnapper, could see all the Greeleys, and Raymonds, and Weeds, and Morgans, and Burrowses, and Parkers, in the State, to their hearts' content, could boil them all down into one man, and make a Governor of him, it wouldn't begin to help them as much as it would to cast even but 50,000 votes for Gerrit Smith! By doing that, they could smite with a Belshazzar palsy every biped bloodhound and Rum Poisoner in the State, for they would see the hand-writing on the wall!



### THE PENNSYLVANIA ELECTION.

The N. Y. Evening Post, like other Republican papers, is claiming the Douglas Democratic victory in Pennsylvania as being much the same thing as a Republican victory, coupling it with the Republican victory in Ohio. Whether they would do the same, in case of the success of Douglas himself, in Illinois, remains to be seen. Says the Post—

"Henceforth the character of American politics is changed. Another power takes possession of the legislation of the federal government, and will hold it hereafter. The element of public opinion, which has so long struggled with the ascendancy of a powerful local institution, is at length triumphant; the local influence is defeated; slavery is beaten in its last strongholds of the North, and the large, liberal spirit in which the plan of our government was at first conceived—a spirit truly national and republican—is again enthroned."

If this does not triumphantly indicate a Douglas platform as henceforth the basis of "American politics" we have failed to understand its meaning. The future of a Republican party (which the Post has hitherto cherished) seems rather misty and hazy. If the Democratic party is coming right, what is wanted of a Republican party?

### TIMELY CONFIRMATION.

Those who doubt or dispute the statements of Gerrit Smith and his friends, would do well to ponder the testimony of a witness, who is opposed to them.

From the N. Y. Times, October 15.

"WHAT IS THE ISSUE?—Kansas is played out. No political movements outside of her own borders can materially affect her future condition. She will be admitted upon her first asking. The Administration dare not risk an attempt to keep her out, or if it should, its defeat will be overwhelming. As a political issue, therefore, the Kansas question belongs to the past. In its nature it was temporary. Time and events have settled it. The destiny of Kansas is fixed, and although the Republicans may rejoice over the result as according to their wishes, they cannot claim to have produced it; nor was the Democratic Party able to retard it. Indeed, it is questionable whether all the political strife which has taken place over Kansas has had any appreciable effect. She is made free by the free population which poured in from the North, and in some measure from the South also. No efforts of parties or politicians could materially hasten or hinder the result."

This goes the full length of the statements of Gerrit Smith and of James Redpath. The people of Kansas, not the Republican party, saved Kansas. But the Times says further—

"The issue in Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana, has not been the old question of Free soil in Kansas, but the division in those States is between the supporters and the opponents of the Administration. Whatever names may be paraded by the parties to the contest, they come substantially to this complexion. Whoever looks at Pennsylvania to-day must see that there are but two parties there—Administration and Anti-Administration. In the election of Tuesday it was simply a question whether Mr. Buchanan's general policy should be approved or condemned. No doubt some clung to him through State pride, personal regard, or party discipline, who condemn his official acts. Yet, really, the vote was for and against the Administration. The like is true, also, of Ohio and Indiana. Illinois will soon be called upon to pronounce upon the same subject. In New York, also, to a certain extent the verdict of the 2d of November must be upon the merits of the Administration. If the two branches of the Opposition had united, as in Pennsylvania, this issue would be perfect here as it was there. In the actual state of the case, however, it is but partially presented, other matters entering largely into the canvass. But the tendency is in the same direction, and in 1859, if not now, New York will vote with direct reference to sustaining or condemning the Administration."

In other words, the "Free Soil question" is obsolete—and the Republican party, as distinguished from Douglas democrats on the "Squatter Sovereignty" platform has but a nominal existence, even now, and can have, as a National party, no future.

It has lost the battle and capitulated. The real object of running Morgan, is not to elect him, nor to keep alive the Republican party, or the "Free Soil

issue" but only to sponge up as many voters as possible, to be transferred into that future party, whose prospective founders are still hunting after an "issue."

### ONE STEP AT A TIME.

"One step at a time, sonnie," said Mrs. Partington, leaning back in her rocking chair and taking a pinch of snuff. "One step at a time. Don't contempt too much at once. It's a nice thing—this reforming—if one only understands it! There's no use tryin' to go too fast and too far—'tis too much of a shock on our poor human natur', and would be very liable to convoke a reaction! Now, for instance, you might resolve to-day, to try and make yourself better, but don't begin on't mighty fierce—that'd spile all! Take about a week to masticate it over in your mind, and then commence moderately, by degrees. You might restrict yourself to lyin' say about ten times a day, which 'd be a great 'eal better 'n to go unrestricted. By 'en by you could cut down the allowance to five times, when you felt able to bear it, and so finally get cured. Then you might rest on't a little before you go fur breaking yourself o' stealin' an' sich. 'Half a loaf's better 'n no bread.' 'One step at a time!'" And the old lady sank back and fanned herself complacently with the N. Y. Observer, while Ike, with a whistle of surprise, cut a summerset and slipped up behind the closet door for a fresh dive into the black-berry jam.

### QUIZ.

### A SINGULAR VICTORY.

The N. Y. Times says:—

"The awful example which Pennsylvania has just made, of our venerable Chief Magistrate, will, we trust, not be lost upon his successors. The moral of the whole story is the folly of treating the Free Soil Party at the North as mere fanatics or sectionalists, who may be larruped into submission."

This looks as though the Times claimed the victory over Buchanan in Pennsylvania, as a triumph of the "Free Soil party"—whose motto was "No more Slave States"—"No Slavery in the Territories"—But in the very same article the Times says—

"One fact is now unalterably established—and that is, that the majority of men of all parties in the Union are determined that, at all cost, the bona fide settlers in all the territories of the United States shall alone decide whether Slavery shall exist among them or not."

And so the triumph of the "Free Soil party" consists in unalterably establishing the principle of the Nebraska bill, of the Democratic Cincinnati Convention of 1856, of Senator Douglass and Mr. Crittenden—the very principle against which the Free Soil and Republican parties were organized, and against which their whole strength was expended.

### Vote's of New York and Brooklyn.

Have you not been ruled, and taxed, and bullied, and disgraced long enough, by the dram sellers? Do they not control all the parties, shape all their platforms, and hold the casting vote in all their nominations?

Are you under any moral, legal, or constitutional obligations to vote for them? Are you their property? Do you belong to them? Do you stand in awe of them?

You know—it is to be presumed you do—that in voting for any candidate of the Democratic, the Republican, and the Native American parties, you are of course, (with few, if any exceptions,) voting for men whose names have been handed up to the sublime Order of Sovereign Dram Sellers, and passed the ordeal without a veto!—Will you vote for them?

Can you vote with either of the parties, and do anything more or better than to choose between candidates selected for you by the Rum Sellers? Is this all that your Right of Suffrage is worth to you? It is, if you must needs vote with one of the parties!

EDIFYING.—The "White Man's Party" is having a glorious jollification over the few negroes it has succeeded in carrying over, to try and help it out of its troubles!

### DEATH OF JUDGE JAY.

It is our sad duty to record the death of Hon. WILLIAM JAY, son of the Revolutionary Statesman, JOHN JAY.—True to the principles of his illustrious father, he was an earnest and active Abolitionist, and, at an early day, identified himself openly with the persecuted pioneers of the now existing agitation of the slavery question. As a member of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, he was the penman of some of its most able documents and stirring appeals, as well as a frequent contributor to anti-slavery periodicals, and the writer of several anti-slavery pamphlets and volumes, which have ever held a high rank among the standard literature of abolitionists. Few men have exerted more influence in carrying forward this and other noble reforms of the age. He died as he had lived, an exemplary Christian, a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, yet in fraternal fellowship with Christians of other sects. "The memory of the just is blessed."

CHARACTERISTIC.—A certain veracious Iago is hoaxing the verdant Editors of our two cities with caricature accounts of the organization of a Gerrit Smith Abolition Society on Thursday Evening in Brooklyn, E. D. So eager was he to repeat the old lie about Gerrit Smith's going to bed at 9 o'clock, and not voting against the Nebraska bill, that he must needs make an occasion for doing so, by forging a new one of his own, to hang it upon, affirming that "when the clock struck nine, imitating their leader, they abandoned their posts and ran off to bed." The truth is, the meeting did not adjourn until a quarter before ten. The rest of the account is still wider from the truth. A fair specimen of the policy of the press towards us. If this is all they can say or do against us, let them say so. Perhaps they would not like to have their readers suspect that the humble servant of "the white man's party" who helps them satyriize a society of "three white and four colored," is himself a somewhat unfavorable specimen of a "colored" man:

### EVILS OF THE CAUCUS SYSTEM.

Every body knows that one of the prominent objects of the "GERRIT SMITH movement" is to break down the Oligarchy of the Caucus. But here comes help from a quarter least expected. Hear the N. Y. Tribune.

"It is one of the most serious objections to that caucus system, which has become almost as much a part of our political institutions as the periodical selection of our legislators and rulers, that it tends very much to aggravate the evil of filling up our legislative bodies, Congress included, with new, inexperienced and untried men. The people, if left to themselves, have a strong disposition to imitate, in the selection of their legislators and other public officers, the prudence of private life. They are apt to consider, in this matter, rather the probability of being well served than the private wishes and personal convenience and ambition of the person who is to serve them. Left to themselves, they are apt, in the selection of their representatives and rulers, to proceed upon the same principles upon which they provide themselves with lawyers, doctors or shoemakers. Having found a man who seems to understand his business, and to be disposed as well as able to serve them faithfully, they are very apt to stick to him, and not capriciously to cast him aside after the service of a year or two, in favor of some new and untried substitute."

"Experience in politics and legislation is not of less importance or value than in law or medicine; and if our Northern people are prevented from acting on that principle in the selection of their public servants, it is mainly if not exclusively, owing to the nominating bodies which have been allowed to thrust themselves between the people and the candidates for office. As things now are, nobody can be a candidate for office, at least not with any chance of election, without a preliminary caucus nomination; and these nominations, as is to well known, proceed on the principle not so much of consulting the good of the public, as of making a distribution of office, so as to give every aspirant in the party his share and his turn. Conscious how disposed the people are to adhere to a meritorious public servant it is a maxim in many parts of the country to allow members of Congress only a single term, lest by longer continuance in service they might gain a hold upon the public mind such as would render it too hazardous to supersede them."



"It is in a considerable measure owing to the fact that the Northern States have been so largely represented in Congress by new and inexperienced members, that in all struggles with the South the numerical superiority of the North has so little availed it. It is upon these new and inexperienced members that loud talk, and threatening hiss, and dictatorial manner of the Southern members make the strongest impression. After a session or two, these impressions wear off, and those who employ these means of intimidation come to be estimated at their true value. It would be easy to mention several remarkable instances of the growth, on the part of Northern Representatives, of self-confidence, courage, spirit and resistance to dictation, consequent upon a prolonged term of service. In fact, the Northern men of decided ability have been very few, whatever their readiness upon first being sent to Congress to submit to Southern dictation, who, if their term of service have been prolonged, have not ended by becoming the decided champions of Northern rights."

The Tribune makes a good beginning. If it will only stay put, it may do the public a good service. The preceding article gives a graphic sketch of the evils under which we are laboring. It gives us a peep into the process by which the tried old veterans of Freedom whom the 'people, if left to themselves' would have sent to Congress, have been set aside by nominating Conventions, acting "on the principle not so much of consulting the good of the public as of making a distribution of office" and putting up novices who, when coming in contact with the experienced champions of the Slave Power, have been "intimidated"—have cowered before the Slave driver, and compromised away one plank of their platform after another, until not one of them is left remaining.

We do not think however, that a "long service" in Congress will give back bone to one that was a compromiser in the beginning. We have evidence to the contrary.

Another illustration might have been introduced by the Tribune, in the recent nomination of E. D. Morgan for Governor, a man of whom probably not one tenth part of the voters of the State had ever heard, before they heard of his nomination, and who know little or nothing else of him now, than the fact that he has been nominated.

"Left to themselves," and acting as they do "in the affairs of private life," they would vote for Gerrit Smith. What other reason could any man give, in voting for Morgan in preference to Smith, but that the former, and not the latter, has been regularly nominated by the delegates of an organized party, acting as a caucus, or in subserviency to a smaller and self-appointed caucus, consulting together in conclave, beforehand?

What was it that party editors and their partizans meant, when they advised us to wait until after their Nominating Convention, before we concluded to rally to the support of a candidate for Governor, who every body knows is better qualified for the office, in every point of view, than any man who could possibly receive the nomination of their party,—fettered and crippled, as they themselves certify it to be, by the fear of Kidnappers and Rum-sellers, insomuch that they dare not oppose themselves against their ruthless depredations? Was not this bidding us surrender our own judgment and convictions to the lottery chances of a nominating caucus, a lottery quite certain to turn us up nothing better than a blank? A course the very opposite to "the prudence of private life?"

And what do they mean now, when, after having nominated such an one, they call upon us to vote for him, instead of voting for the man of our choice, if it be not that we ought to come under the control of a nominating caucus, and not venture to have any mind of our own?

The whole course of the N. Y. Tribune will have to be changed, if it is ever to do anything toward emancipating the voters from the dominion of King Caucus! It must quit its folly of charging upon them the election of one bad candidate because they will not vote for another—of electing Polk by not voting for Henry Clay—of electing Parker by not voting for Morgan. For all this rests on the assumption of the

duty or necessity of voting for the nominees of some caucus, like those the Tribune has described,—allowing the people no other alternative than that of choosing between the dictatorship of one caucus and that of another.

And it is quite remarkable that the Tribune's only illustration of the evils of the Caucus System, is taken from the party of which the Tribune is the chiefest advocate in the country, the very party whose caucus nominations it requires us to regard as conclusive of our duties, in the exercise of the right of suffrage!

The following is from "The Free South" (formerly the "Kentucky News,") Newport, Kentucky.

#### A FREE REPUBLIC.

We remarked in a late editorial that the vital principle of the Republican party, if such it had, consisted in asserting Freedom for all the Territories, and the addition of none but Free States to the Union. But this principle cannot be successfully maintained without, at the same time, boldly taking the ground that all the States of this Union are entitled to be, and of right should be Free States. Slavery should not exist in the Territories or be permitted in new States, because it is anti-republican, and is destructive of that personal liberty and those personal rights, which our Government was formed to secure; and for the same reason, it should be abolished as soon as practicable in all the States where it now exists. Its extension into new territory is opposed because it is a moral and civil wrong, sapping the foundation of national morality and civil government; the same argument is just as pertinent against its existence in the States.

Every State in the Union should be a Free State. This was the design the fathers had in view, when they erected what they proudly called a Free Republic on this Western continent. All the original States were Slave States; but the spirit and tendency of the new Federal Government was to make them all Free. Had it been permitted to have its free, normal course, it would have accomplished that work, which was only partially completed. It should be the business of the men of this generation to finish it.

This is no sectional work, but strictly national. Freedom is the national idea; but the idea of slavery is sectional, and worse, anti-republican. The institution of a Government for the enjoyment and perpetuation of liberty, right and justice for and to every man, made Freedom national, and placed the brand of sectionalism upon slavery.

This national idea of Universal Freedom is the only true unitary idea for the Republic or a national party. Without it, the Union must of necessity fall to pieces, for want of that cement which only can preserve it. Americans should never lose sight of the great fact that their Government is, or professes to be founded on the principle of "Equal Justice to ALL MEN," and that every departure from this principle endangers its stability.

A national party is needed that shall fearlessly avow this principle, and be true to its professions. If the present Republican party is too cowardly or too corrupt for this mission, it must be superseded by another which shall not, like the Democratic pro-slavery organization, plant itself on merely sectional issues, but on those which are truly American and national.

The sectional pro-slavery party calls itself national, and is laboring to make itself really so. Its success will be the destruction of liberty and of the Republic; for these two must stand or fall together. It seeks to nationalize the idea that there can be property in man. It has succeeded in infusing into the mind of the nation, almost universally, that slave property has a rightful existence in certain States, and that the nominal owner's right to such property should be acknowledged and vindicated, when the property transports itself or is transported into a State whose constitution and laws declare all men to be equally entitled to their freedom. The same party now claims that property in man exists in all the Territories, and that the National Government is bound by the Constitution to guard and protect it there. Thus far has that party progressed in making slavery national. Its work is in the last stages of completion.

The success of the pro-slavery faction has been owing to the non-existence of any national party adhering consistently and steadily to the true national idea of a Free Republic. It is now time to inaugurate such a party. Is it too much to ask when the sectional slave power sets up its arrogant claim to be national, when it has compelled the National Government to legalize slavery in every State in the Union, and when it claims for it a constitutional existence in all the Territories—is it anything extravagant or fanatical to desire that there shall be unconquerable Phalanx of Free Men, whose position shall be in all points directly un-

antagonistic to that of the Oligarchy, and which shall seek to make Human Liberty as wide and universal as their opponents are seeking to extend slavery? The demand of the one is for a Despotism of Slavery; let the demand for the other be for a Republic of Free Men.

There are this day thousands and tens of thousands among the non-slaveholders, and many among the slaveholders of the South, who would hail with glad hearts the rise of a true national party as the harbinger of their deliverance from the house of bondage. They see no hope for them in the present political party that limits itself to the idea of the non-extension of slavery, and is not firm or consistent even in that. It has no word or hope or cheer for the struggling, despairing sons of Freedom in the Slave States. It expressly denies that it has any wish or desire to see those States made Free. It is, therefore, like its opponent, sectional in its views and objects. The great want of the time is a national party which shall unite the South and the North in earnest and effectual efforts to save the Union, and give us what our fathers anticipated, a FREE REPUBLIC.

#### CONDITION OF OUR CITY SCHOOLS.

"The New-York Observer" appears to be quite alarmed at the discovery that the Board of Education is now so constituted that the majority of its members are willing to have the Bible excluded from our City schools, and that from thirteen of those schools it is actually excluded. It relates, with no little show of horror, that a gentleman lately visited one of these schools, and, having occasion to refer to the Bible, not a copy could be found among teachers or pupils, though the latter numbered upward of a thousand.

"It is rather late in the day—though even death-bed repentance is better than nothing—for *The Observer* to awake to this state of things. That journal has been doing its very best, for years past, to fill up the Board of Education with politicians ready at any time to barter off the Bible and their own souls into the bargain, for a few dozen Irish votes. We say *The Observer* has been thus employed, because it has been doing its best to sustain that party in our City, State, and National politics, whose candidates for seats in the Board of Education are, too many of them, of the description above set forth. It never will answer for *The Observer* to say that the election of school officers need not be and ought not to be "dragged into the mire of politics." In this country, every elective office is so dragged, especially by the party to which *The Observer* gives its hearty and zealous support. The sustentation of a slave-driving National Administration necessarily carries with it the sustentation of an unworthy, incompetent and immoral Board of Education, or of enough such members at least in it, as to taint it effectually. If *The Observer* will share the pleasure of helping to sustain such National Administrations as now controls affairs at Washington, it must be content to submit to the pain of helping to mismanage our schools, and to keep in office a thoroughly corrupt and incompetent Municipal Administration. The choosing to the Board of Education of men who cannot write their own names, and of others with much worse disqualifications than that, is a regular part of the political system by which the support of this City is secured to the Democratic party, so called. If *The Observer* will support that party, it must be content to take it with all its incidents.—N. Y. Tribune.

The Tribune hits off the N. Y. Observer about right. It might be added that so long as the Observer is in religious fellowship with those who withhold the Bible from the laboring people, and says nothing against it, it must be in an awkward position for complaining, that the Bible is not used in our city schools.

But there is another view of the matter. The Tribune draws so dark a picture of the condition and prospects of education, in the hands of government officials that, in view of it, the Tribune might learn to appreciate the objections urged against governmental supervision, by Gerrit Smith. It is certainly a grave question, and one that has scarcely begun to receive the medita-



ive attention which its importance demands. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Smith's views on this particular point, it is well that he has introduced it before the people. Communities must be educated. They must be supplied with the means of literary and religious instruction. We must have churches and schools. But is Government, is even *our* Government, controlled by political parties, the proper depository of so sacred a trust?

In respect to their providing public religious instruction, at the public expense, we, in this country, with few exceptions, respond, *No*. Then comes another question—Can religious and literary instruction be safely and properly separated from each other? Most earnest religious persons, at first thought, would readily respond again, *No*. But immediately there comes up a third question—How are these two responses to be reconciled? We all say that Government is not competent to provide religious instruction. And, if earnestly religious, we say also that religious and literary education must needs be blended together. How then can public education be entrusted to the Government? There seems to be an enigma for solution here. How shall we dispose of it?

Most people have never thought of it,—Gerrit Smith has. And his solution is, that schools, like churches, should be supported upon the voluntary principle, and without the supervision of Government. He is not willing that the political party should have the power to "exclude the Bible and the voice of prayer from the schools," as the N. Y. Observer complains, is done, and as (according to the Tribune) the Observer's own party is doing. Very evidently, if the Government supports the schools, the Government will control them. In other words, the parties, while we have parties, will control them. Our Protestant Bible may be the authorized book, one year—the Roman Catholic the next—the Revelations of Andrew Jackson Davis the next, and so on. Though Protestants may retain the ascendancy, there is a prospect of rival translations, liberal as well as orthodox, and Government officials must decide between them, or say whether all shall be alike banished. Then again, if Protestants insist that Catholics shall help support Protestant schools, what will they say when a Catholic majority shall turn the tables upon them—as Unitarians in Massachusetts once did upon the Orthodox, in respect to public taxes for the support of religious teaching? Here is something to think of, before hastily condemning the views of Gerrit Smith. Assuredly, it would be quite as absurd to refuse voting for Gerrit Smith, because of his theory on this subject, as it would have been to have refused voting for Gov. Seward, because he was in favor of giving a part of the public school money to the Catholics.

A DELICATE STOMACH.—Brother Oliver Johnson is "shocked and disgusted" at some of the sentiments expressed by Gerrit Smith in relation to the suppression of kidnapping, to wit: the shedding of white men's blood in defence of a black child whom the Federal Government might seek to steal from the free soil of New York. It seems strange that brother Johnson, whose employment it has been, through so many years, to contemplate the shedding of rivers of black men's blood, at the behest of slavery, should become so suddenly squeamish at the idea of the shedding of white men's blood at the call of freedom!

If anything could turn an anti-slavery stomach, in his neighborhood, one would think it would be the increase of pro-slavery sentiment which has accompanied the accession of anti-slavery talent in the columns of the New York Tribune. We understand that an ex-editor, and one contributor of the Anti-Slavery Standard are now regularly engaged in the corps of the Tribune: perhaps brother J. is looking for something in the same direction, and his nausea is the result of the crisis through which he is passing. We hope he may be mercifully spared to get over his "shock" and "disgust," and that he may live to see New York a free State under Governor Smith. \*

From the Hour and the Man.

#### COLORED AMERICANS AND THE REPUBLICANS.

The N. Y. Times is a leading Republican paper of New York city. We have little respect for it, of course. Nevertheless, like the Tribune, it says many things worth considering. The Times reviews at length a letter of J. W. Watkins, (a colored man) printed in the Tribune, justifying his taking the stump for Morgan, because he expects "colored suffrage" through the ascendancy of the Republican party. We clip from the Times review the following:

"Mr. Watkins may, however, rest assured, that, in respect to the object he and his Convention profess especially to aim at—the extension of negro suffrage—it makes no practical difference what party succeeds. Nothing could be further from the minds of the leaders, not only of the Democratic but of the Republican Party, than to abolish the distinction of a property qualification in the case of colored voters. It has not been done when it might have been, and it will not be. Does Mr. Watkins forget how the resolution which passed the Republican Legislature a year or two ago to amend the Constitution in that regard was smothered in a pigeon-hole of the Executive Chamber? And even if submitted to the people, it would have been voted down by an overwhelming majority. We are telling Mr. Watkins facts and truths. He and his associates have a perfect right to support any man they prefer for Governor, but their reasons when they choose to publish them are open to criticism. Gerrit Smith has the fortune to experience from Abolitionists, white as well as black, a very small measure of gratitude. When there is money to be paid, land to be given away, or Jerrys to be rescued, Mr. Smith is a man much lauded and sought after. But let him take the field for Governor, and even the black men turn their backs upon him.

Mr. Watkins claims that there are 11,000 colored voters in the State. It may possibly be true. By the census of 1855 the entire Negro population was 45,286, of whom 9,330 are set down as tax-payers—in other words, voters. In order to accomplish something in a practical way, we see even the colored Abolitionists now turning the cold shoulder upon Gerrit Smith—a movement on their part which a few years ago would have been deemed incredible.

A RARE OPPORTUNITY.—Since 1840, Anti-Slavery men in this State have complained that there has been no issue at the election, on which they could distinctly vote according to their convictions. There is now a fair and square issue. The Republican Party and their candidate MORGAN, acquiesce in yielding State-Sovereignty to the Fugitive Slave law, as long as it shall remain a law. GERRIT SMITH affirms his intention to assert the supremacy of State Sovereignty over the Fugitive Slave law: and in doing this follows the glorious example of Gov. De Witt Clinton, who threatened to march the militia of the State of New York down to the District of Columbia to liberate Gilbert Horton, a colored citizen of New York, arrested and held there on suspicion of being a slave. \*

#### Who Saved Kansas?

The New York Tribune, Oct. 15, in reply to Gov. Denver, says—

"The game of spoliation and outrage in Kansas was deliberately begun by your party—that whose cause you pettifog, with whose interests you fully identify yourself. They had it all their own way for a while, but Sharp's rifles and Northern immigration at length turned the tables upon them, and they are now back in Missouri, or have passed on to Arizona and Sonora."

Why then does the Tribune find fault with Gerrit Smith for saying the same thing? Let it be understood. The question is not whether a majority of the defenders of Kansas, or a majority of those who contributed to their support, were Republicans, including Abolitionists who voted with them. The question is, whether the Republican party, by its political action in Congress, saved Kansas. Mr. Smith was not maligning the Republicans, as indifferent to the defence of Kansas. He only showed that it was not defended by their political machinery—by their action in Congress—that their policy of "limitation" by Federal action was a failure. And the Tribune's account of the matter corroborates his statement. Not a word does it say to Gov. Denver about any defence of Kansas, except in the manner indicated by Gerrit Smith.

Thus we dispose of another of the Tribune's six reasons why Gerrit Smith should be accounted an "unsound and unwise statesman"—not fit to be elected Governor. It is because Gerrit Smith's account of the deliverance of Kansas agrees with that of the N. Y. Tribune's Letter to Gov. Denver.

AN ARTFUL DODGE.—The Republican party having abandoned all and every anti-slavery principle, yet needing in its desperation, anti-slavery votes, on the one hand, while it dare not affirm a single anti-slavery issue in the fear of losing its pro-slavery supporters on the other—has cunningly resorted to the plan of hiring as many colored men as it can, to go through the State, and advocate its cause; shrewdly believing that the very faces of these men, thus engaged, will be a sufficient endorsement of the anti-slavery character of the party, whilst they cannot of course, commit the party to Abolitionism. \*

A NEW COMET.—Professor Greeley, of the Republican Observatory, announced last week, the discovery of a new comet, which he has named William J. Watkins, in the constellation *Canis Minor*. It is rapidly approaching the Sun, and by the fourth of November will have reached its perihelion. The tail of this comet (which is colored) makes a great spread; having recently and very suddenly reversed itself, it looks curly. Just a twelvemonth ago, says the learned *sagan*, this comet presented a tremendous length of jaw. \*

STILL ANOTHER.—Comets are becoming as plenty as asteroids. Mr. Bigelow of the Post Observatory has recently discovered in the *Milky Way*, two comets which he designates as the "Hodges;" they are said to pull famously at the republican teats. Their nebulae are not elongated, but surround the nuclei—in fact are bushy. There is an opinion prevalent that they foreshadow the calamities of the Republican party. \*

A DELUSION REMOVED.—In its wonted election agonies, the "Tribune" of this morning exposes the delusion by which it has hitherto hoodwinked many Anti-slavery voters into the belief that in voting for MORGAN they were voting a ticket with the "odor" of Anti-slavery about it: it says—

"The result (of the election) ought to be wholly free from doubt, but is not. Had the Union State Ticket been formed at Syracuse on the 8th or 9th ult., and the union followed up by union in the several Districts, we should have swept the State by one hundred thousand majority \* \* \*

Now it is notorious that the union of the American



